

### REMARKS

Claims 1-9 and 20-34 are currently pending in this application. Claims 1, 2, 22, and 25 have been amended to clarify certain features of these claims to expedite prosecution of this application, and without prejudice to pursuing these claims in unamended or other forms in a continuation or other application. Claims 31-34 have been added in this response, and no claims have been canceled.

In the Office Action mailed June 6, 2008, pending claims 1-9 and 20-30 were rejected. More specifically, the status of the application in light of this Office Action is as follows:

- (A) Claims 2 and 25 were objected to because of minor informalities;
- (B) Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, and 20-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over U.S. Patent No. 5,909,226 to Takeda ("Takeda");
- (C) Claims 4, 24, and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the combination of Takeda and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US2003/0184627 to Sasaki et al. ("Sasaki"); and
- (D) Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the combination of Takeda, U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US2003/0184771 to Yamamoto et al. ("Yamamoto"), and U.S. Patent No. 6,151,140 to Wilcox et al. ("Wilcox").

The undersigned attorney and his colleague, Aaron Poledna, wish to thank the Examiner for engaging in a telephone conference on August 27, 2008, to discuss the present Office Action, the cited references, and the pending claims. The applicants request that this paper constitute the applicants' Interview Summary. If the Examiner notices any deficiencies in this regard, he is encouraged to contact the undersigned attorney to correct such deficiencies.

The following remarks summarize and expand upon the results of the August 27th telephone conference, and they also reflect the agreement reached between the undersigned attorney and the Examiner during the telephone conference. For example, the following remarks reflect the Examiner's acknowledgement that Takeda cannot support a Section 103 rejection of amended claim 1.

A. Response to the Objections of Claims 2 and 25

Claims 2 and 25 were objected to because of minor informalities. More specifically, claim 2 included "the paper discharge path being generally with the first axis," which has been amended to "the paper discharge path being generally parallel with the first axis," in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. In addition, claim 25 included "a first lateral dimension and a second lateral dimension," which has been amended to "a longitudinal dimension and a lateral dimension," in accordance with the Examiner's suggestion. Moreover, claim 25 was also objected to for lacking antecedent basis for the term "the printer carriage." Claim 25 has been amended to replace "the printer carriage" with "the printer cartridge," which has antecedent basis in claim 25. Accordingly, the objections to claims 2 and 25 should be withdrawn.

B. Response to the Section 103 Rejection of Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, and 20-29 (Takeda)

Claims 1-3, 5-7, 9, and 20-29 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over Takeda. As stated above, the Examiner acknowledged during the August 27th telephone conference that Takeda cannot support a Section 103 rejection of amended independent claim 1. Accordingly, in light of this agreement, the Section 103 rejection of claim 1 should be withdrawn.

Claims 2, 3, 5-7, and 9 depend from base claim 1. Accordingly, the Section 103 rejection of claims 2, 3, 5-7, and 9 should be withdrawn for at least the reasons discussed above with reference to base claim 1, and for the additional features of these dependent claims.

Independent claims 22 and 25, as amended, include several features generally similar to those of claim 1 (e.g., a printer cartridge that is accessible in a replacement position outside a footprint of a scanner when a scanner lid remains in a closed position). Accordingly, the Section 103 rejection of independent claims 22 and 25 should be withdrawn for at least the reasons discussed above with reference to claim 1, and for the additional features of these independent claims.

Claims 23 and 24 depend from base claim 22, and claims 26-29 depend from base claim 25. Accordingly, the Section 103 rejection of claims 23, 24, and 26-29 should be withdrawn for at least the reasons discussed above with reference to their respective base claims, and for the additional features of these dependent claims.

C. Response to the Section 103 Rejection of Claims 4, 24, and 30 (Takeda and Sasaki)

Claims 4, 24, and 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the combination of Takeda and Sasaki. Claim 4 depends from base claim 1, claim 24 depends from base claim 22, and claim 30 depends from base claim 25. The Office Action relies on Sasaki for disclosing a system that feeds paper along an "L" shaped path. (Office Action, p. 12.) Even assuming for the sake of argument that this is correct (and the applicants expressly do not), Sasaki fails to cure the above-noted deficiencies of Takeda to support a Section 103 rejection of base claims 1, 22, and 25. For example, Sasaki fails to disclose or suggest a printer cartridge that is accessible in a replacement position outside a footprint of a scanner when a scanner lid remains in a closed position. Accordingly, claims 4, 24, and 30 are allowable over the combination of Takeda and Sasaki for at least the reason that these references, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the features of base claims 1, 22, and 25, and the additional features of dependent claims 4, 24, and 30. Therefore, the Section 103 rejection of dependent claims 4, 24, and 30 should be withdrawn.

D. Response to the Section 103 Rejection of Claim 8 (Takeda, Yamamoto, and Wilcox)

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) over the combination of Takeda, Yamamoto, and Wilcox. Claim 8 depends from claim 1. The Office Action relies on Yamamoto for disclosing a control panel, and on Wilcox for disclosing a control panel that may be lifted up with the top portion of the imaging device. (Office Action, p. 13.) Even assuming for the sake of argument that this is correct (and the applicants expressly do not), Yamamoto and Wilcox fail to cure the above-noted deficiencies of Takeda to support a Section 103 rejection of base claim 1. For example, Yamamoto and Wilcox fail to disclose or suggest a printer cartridge that is accessible in a replacement position outside a footprint of a scanner when a scanner lid remains in a closed position. Accordingly, claim 8 is allowable over the combination of Takeda, Yamamoto, and Wilcox for at least the reason that these references, either alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest the features of base claim 1, and the additional features of dependent claim 8. Therefore, the Section 103 rejection of dependent claim 8 should be withdrawn.


E. New Claims 31-34

New claims 31-34 have been added in the present application. The subject matter of claims 31-34 is supported by the Figures and text of the original application. Therefore, claims 31-34 do not add any new matter to the application and are fully supported under 35 U.S.C. §112, first paragraph. New base claim 31 includes, for example, several features similar to those of claim 1 (e.g., an ink cartridge that is accessible in a replacement position outside of a scanning footprint when a scanning lid remains in a closed position). Accordingly, new base claim 31 is patentable over the applied references for at least the reasons discussed above with reference to claim 1, and for the additional features of this independent claim. New claims 32-34 depend from new base claim 31. Accordingly, new dependent claims 32-34 are also patentable over the applied references for at least the reasons discussed above with reference to new base claim 31, and for the additional features of these new dependent claims.

**Conclusion**

In view of the foregoing, the pending claims comply with 35 U.S.C. §112 and are patentable over the applied art. The applicants accordingly request reconsideration of the application and a mailing of a Notice of Allowance. If the Examiner has any questions or believes a telephone conference would expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is encouraged to contact Cameron Pilling at (206) 359-6123.

Respectfully submitted,  
Perkins Coie LLP



---

Cameron B. Pilling  
Registration No. 62,085

Date: September 8, 2008

**Correspondence Address:**

Customer No. 25096  
Perkins Coie LLP  
P.O. Box 1247  
Seattle, Washington 98111-1247  
(206) 359-8000